

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR

Village of Niles

"Where People Count"

7601 Milwaukee Avenue, Niles, Illinois 60714 Telephone (708) 967-6100

RECEIVED

MAY 29 1996

May 23, 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

Mr. Reed E. Hundt, Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 814
Washington, DC 20554

Subject: *Redlining/Failure to Serve by Open Video System Provider, CS Docket 96-46*

Dear Chairman Hundt:

The Village of Niles is concerned about claims by potential OVS providers that they can "pick and choose" what areas to serve because this may lead to discrimination and redlining that will result in minority, low income and growing areas of our nation's municipalities from being served by an OVS provider.

We are particularly concerned about this where the OVS provider is the only land-line video provider. This may occur in a substantial number of our nation's communities, especially if cable operators are allowed to switch to becoming OVS providers (or through the provision of telephone service the cable operators claim they are entitled to provide OVS service). Also, the new Telecommunications Act allows telephone companies to buy out cable companies in certain situations; and the laws of economics may result in there being only one video/data/telephone provider in a given area, which could well be an OVS provider.

Thus, there is a substantial risk that the Open Video System provider could be the only wired, land-line video provider in many area. If such a monopoly OVS provider has no restraints on where and whom it serves, it is possible they may discriminate against or fail to serve large segments of our population.


Municipalities have classically addressed this issue as a part of the just compensation they receive from cable companies for using public right-of-way. The public, through the municipality, is entitled to just compensation for the use of its property. This compensation includes not only money, but requirements to serve all residents of a city.

Very truly yours,
/s/ [Signature]

The Village of Niles strongly urges the Commission to prevent OVS from becoming a "redlining" serve where large segments of our population can not receive it. Further, per the Commission's *ex parte* rules, a copy of this letter is being provided to the Secretary for inclusion in the public record.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.


Sincerely,



Nicholas B. Blase
Mayor

cc: Mr. William F. Canton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Room 222
Washington, DC 20554
Mr. Blair Levin, Chief of Staff for Chairman Hundt
Federal Communications Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554
The Honorable Paul Simon
United States Senator for Illinois
462 Dirksen Building
Washington, DC 20510
The Honorable Carol Mosley Braun
United States Senator for Illinois
331 Hart Building
Washington, DC 20510

RECEIVED
MAY 29 1996
FCC MAIL ROOM



CORNELIUS B. WAUD
MAYOR

May 23, 1996

Mr. Reed E. Hundt
Chairman
Federal Communications Commission
Room 814
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Ms. Rachelle B. Chong
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
Room 844
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Ms. Susan Ness
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
Room 832
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Mr. James H. Quello
Commissioner
Federal Communications Commission
Room 802
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

RE: Redlining / Failure to Serve by Open Video System (OVS) Provider, CS Docket 96-46

Dear Chairman Hundt and Commissioners Chong, Ness and Quello:

We are very concerned about claims by potential OVS providers that they can "pick and choose" what areas to serve because this may lead to discrimination and redlining that will result in minority, low income and growing areas of our nation's municipalities not being served by an OVS provider.

We are particularly concerned where the OVS providers is the only land-line video provider. This may occur in a substantial number of our nation's communities, especially if cable operators are allowed to switch to becoming OVS providers (or through the provision of telephone service the cable operators claim they are entitled to provide OVS service). Also, the new Telecommunications Act allows telephone companies to buy out cable companies in certain situations; and the laws of economics may result in there being only one video/data/telephone provider in a given area, which could well be an OVS provider.

There is a substantial risk that the Open Video System provider could be the only wired, land-line video provider in many areas. If such a monopoly OVS provider has no restraints on where and whom it serves, it is likely to discriminate against or fail to serve large segments of our population.

5/24/96
6

There has been discrimination and failure to serve problems even in the cable area. We are concerned that if the phone companies have no restraints there could be similar problems here, such as in inner city areas (e.g. Anacostia or similar inner city portions of our major cities). We are also concerned about the problem in lower density suburbs on the edge of urban areas where the OVS provider may claim there is not sufficient population density to warrant service.

Municipalities have classically addressed this issue as a part of the just compensation they receive from cable companies for using public rights-of-way. This compensation is not only monetary but also includes requirements to serve all residents of a city, or serve all areas with a certain number of dwelling units per mile in exchange for the use of public property.

We strongly urge the Commission to prevent OVS from becoming a "redlining" service where large segments of our population cannot receive it. In your OVS rules we urge you to consider and adopt the recommendations set forth in the May 14 letter to the Cable Bureau from Counsel for Michigan, Indiana and Texas Communities (MIT Communities). A copy of this letter is attached.

Per the Commission's *ex parte* rules, a copy of this letter is being provided to the Secretary for inclusion in the public record.

Very truly yours,



Cornelius B. Waud
Mayor

jc

attachment

cc: Mr. Blair Levin, Chief of Staff for Chairman Hundt
Ms. Suzanne Toller, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Chong
Ms. Mary McManus, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Ness
✓ Mr. William F. Caton, Acting Secretary, FCC
Congressman John Porter
Senator Paul Simon
Senator Carol Moselely-Braun

RECEIVED

MAY 29 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLP}
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

ONEKIEWATER PLACE
SUITE 352 - GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN 49501-0352
TELEPHONE 616/776-6000 - FAX 616/776-7000

JAMES N. LEVY, JR.
WILLIAM A. VANT (NY)
HILARY C. SELL
PETER ADAMSTROM
RONNIE J. ZAVEL
KENT J. VANA
CARL S. WILSON
JOHN K. WITTE
JOHN C. CARROLL
DONALD L. JENNISON
DANIEL C. MCMONAGH
GARY A. SCHMIDT
THOMAS T. HUFF
TIMOTHY J. GUSTIN
JOHN E. MCANARY
DAVID HOFFUS
J. TERRY MORAN
THOMAS J. MULLER
THOMAS J. BARNES

ROBERT A. BLOOMER
R. J. HARRIS, JR.
LARRY J. TILLET
BRUCE A. BARNHART
WILLIAM A. STESMA
JACK L. SAGE
JEFFREY L. SCHMIDT
THOMAS G. NEHLING
JOHN W. PESTLE
ROBERT J. COOPER
FRANK G. PUNTIN
RYAN D. DEBOS
RICHARD A. HENKEL
RANDALL W. OLAKER
PETER A. SMITH
MARK C. HANKEST
BARBARA A. LANKFEST
THOMAS L. LOCKHART
ROBERT L. DUNN

BRUCE A. HARRIS
DAVID C. COHEN
JONATHAN M. COHEN
ERIC J. SCHNEIDERMAN
TERESA S. BRIDGE
JEFFREY E. HUGHES
RICHARD W. BUTLER, JR.
LAWRENCE P. DUNN
MATTHEW G. ZIMMERMAN
WILLIAM E. SCHMIDT
JOHN PATRICK WHITE
CHARLES M. TONTON
PAUL H. KARA
JEFFREY D. SMITH
H. LAWRENCE SMITH
THOMAS C. CLINTON
MARK L. COLLINS
JONATHAN W. ANDERSON
CARL OOSTERHOUSE

WILLIAM J. LAWRENCE III
DAVID M. PALMER
ROSEAN M. WYNGAARDEN
CAROL S. JONES
STEPHEN P. AMERSON
DAVID E. SCHMIDT
MICHAEL G. WOODWARD
TIMOTHY L. STANLEY
ROBERT E. HOBBS
MARK E. ALLARD
TIMOTHY E. EAGLE
DAVID A. REED
DONALD P. LAFLUKE
MICHAEL S. WELTSEE
GEORGE B. DAVIS
JACQUELINE D. SCOTT
H. STEVENSON JOHNSTON
DAVID E. WILSON
HARVEY W. BIRNBAUM

ELIZABETH JOY ROSS
JOEL E. BANA
RYAN S. KERRY
SCOTT A. HULLINGA
MICHAEL J. MARONIA
MICHAEL F. KELLY
KATHLEEN P. ROCHMAN
JONATHAN J. RAJES
RICHARD D. REES
JAMES R. STALLER
RICHARD K. STROMS
JEFFREY S. CLARINGTON
HARRISON POTTER
VICTOR E. YOUNG
ANDREW J. KICK
PATRICK A. MILES, JR.
ERIC J. GUMBIN
STEVEN J. MORAN
KEVIN ABRAHAM BYRNE

THOMAS J. ALLEN
MICHAEL R. HEDGECOCK
THOMAS G. KYROS
ALFRED L. SCHNEIDER, JR.
PAMELA J. TYLER
MARY C. BONHOMIA
JOHN M. BYLUM
JOSEPH B. LEVY
EDWARD J. MARELY
MARK M. DAVIS
LINDA L. BUNGE
ANTHONY B. GORDON
NIVERSITY MOLADAY
ERIC C. FLEETHAM
RICHARD B. EVANS
RANDALL L. GORDON
MARC DANIELAN
CHRISTIE PATY HENGE

JOHN L. WIERENGO, JR.
F. WILLIAM HUTCHINGS
B. STUART HOFFUS
DAVID M. JORDON
M. EDWARD PAUL

May 16, 1996

Ex Parte

Mr. William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW - Room 222
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Implementation of Section 302 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996:
CS Dkt. No. 96-46

Dear Mr. Caton:

This notice of a written *ex parte* presentation in the above-referenced proceeding is provided for inclusion in the public record in accordance with the Commission's *ex parte* rules.


Pursuant to a question from Cable Services Bureau Chief Meredith Jones, the attached letter was provided to her and to the other individuals identified as cc recipients of this letter.

Please direct any questions relating to these matters to the undersigned.

With best wishes,

Very truly yours,

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLP}


John W. Pestle

JWP/nk

cc: Meredith Jones
Gary Lader
Rick Chessen
Suzanne Toller

Mary McManus
Blair Levin
Jackie Chorney

RECEIVED

MAY 29 1996

FCC MAIL ROOM

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

BRUNSWATER PLACE
POST OFFICE BOX 152 • GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN 49501-0152
TELEPHONE (616) 566-6000 • FAX (616) 566-7000

EMERSON PARK JR.
WILLIAM A. ANDERSON
HILARY L. SMITH
MICHAEL KRISTIANSON
ROBERT J. ELEVETT
KARLE VARRA
CARLE VARRA
JOHN C. CARLISLE
DONALD L. JOHNSON
DANIEL G. MCKENNA
GARY P. KINNEL
THOMAS T. TRUMP
TIMOTHY J. CLAYTON
JOHN E. MAGARRY
DAVE MORRIS
TERRY MORAN
THOMAS J. MULLER
THOMAS J. BARNES

WILLIAM J. K. JOHNSON
ROTHMAN & SONS
MARK J. HILL
WILLIAM A. BARNHART
FREDERICK A. JOYNER
JACK B. SAUTER
JERRY L. SCHAU
THOMAS G. DENLINGER
JOHN W. COSTLE
ROBERT P. COOPER
FRANK G. DUNTON
RYAN D. DEEMS
RICHARD A. HICKER
RANDALL W. BRAKER
PETER A. SMIT
MARK C. HANSEN
MARLYN A. LAHNER
THOMAS L. LUCCHARET
RONALD L. DIAMOND

DEBBIE JOHNSON
DREW C. JOHNSON
JOHN J. MOGAN
GREGORY JOHNSON
THERESA S. DECKER
JOHN R. HUGHES
MICHAEL W. BUTLER, JR.
LAWRENCE P. BURNS
MATTHEW P. ZIMMERMAN
WILLIAM E. BOHN
JOHN PATRICK WHITE
CHARLES M. DENTON
PAUL M. KABA
JOHN D. SMITH
H. LAWRENCE SMITH
THOMAS C. CLINTON
MARK L. COLLINS
JONATHAN W. ANDERSON
CARL COSTERHOUSE

WILLIAM J. LAWRENCE
GREGORY M. PALLER
JULIAN S. WATKINS
KATHLEEN S. KIMES
STEPHEN P. FENNIGAN
DAVID S. KIRKBY
MICHAEL G. WOODWORTH
TIMOTHY J. TORINGA
PEARL R. RIVERS
MARK S. ALLARD
TIMOTHY E. EAGLE
DAVID A. RHOM
DONALD P. LAWLESS
MICHAEL S. HANLON
GEOFFREY DAVIS
JACQUELINE D. SCOTT
N. STEVENSON JENNETTE H.
DAVID B. PRESTON
JOSEPH W. RESOLVE

ELIZABETH JOHNSON
PALLER
JOHN S. RICE
SCOTT A. HUGENGA
MICHAEL J. MCKENNA
MICHAEL E. KELLY
KATHLEEN P. ROENTGEN
JERRY J. FLASER
RICHARD D. FRIS
JAMES R. STADLER
RICHARD R. STRONG
JERRY S. GRAMMETT
MAUREN POTTER
VICKI S. YOUNG
ANDREW L. KOT
PATRICK A. MOLES, JR.
ERIC J. CURRY
JENNIFER J. MORRIS
KEVIN ABRAHAM RYNERA KOT

THOMAS J. ANDERSON
MICHAEL J. JOHNSON
THOMAS G. JOHNSON
ALFRED L. SCHUBERT, JR.
PAMELA J. TUTTLE
MARY C. JOHNSON
JOHN M. RYLAND
JOHN R. LEVAM
STEWART J. MONROE
MARK M. DAVIS
LINDA L. BUNGE
ANTHONY L. COMDEN
REYALY HOLLADAY
ERIC C. FURTHAM
RICHARD J. EVANS
RANDALL J. GROMMETT
MARC DANBMAN
CHRISTIE BATTI HUNCE

JOHN L. WATKINS
KATHLEEN S. KIMES
TERRANCE S. JOHNSON
JOHN M. RYLAND
MICHAEL E. KELLY
JAMES R. STADLER
JOHN L. WATKINS, JR.
P. WILLIAM HUTCHINS
R. STEWART HOPKIN
GORDON S. BOOZER
H. EDWARD PAUL

May 14, 1996

Ms. Meredith Jones
Chief
Cable Services Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
2033 M Street, NW
Room 918
Washington, DC 20554

Re: OVS Rulemaking -- Area Served

Dear Meredith:

Thank you for taking the time to meet with representatives of the Michigan, Indiana and Texas (MIT) Communities last Friday. Your doing so is greatly appreciated.

You asked the communities to respond on the issue of whether an OVS provider has a "universal service" requirement. In summary, we believe that OVS providers are subject to federal and local restrictions on where they serve. This is necessary to prevent discrimination, redlining and "economic redlining" which would result in minority, low income and growing areas of our nation's municipalities from being served by any cable or OVS provider.

We are particularly concerned about this in the situation where the OVS provider is the only land line video provider, which is likely to occur in a substantial percentage of the nation's communities. This could occur, in particular, if cable operators are allowed to switch to becoming OVS providers (and is an additional reason why this should not happen).

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLP}
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ms. Meredith Jones
May 14, 1996
Page 2

Further detail explaining the preceding points is as follows.

OVS Overbuilding Not Only Scenario: Much of the discussion to date on OVS has implicitly focused on the "overbuild" situation, that is, where an OVS provider would be serving an area already served by an incumbent cable operator. Although overbuilding may occur in some instances (and it has been rare in the U.S. to date) serious concerns from allowing an OVS operator discretion on where and whom to serve arise in the more likely situation of the OVS provider being the only (i.e. - monopoly) land-line video provider. This is discussed next.

OVS the Only Provider: The likely situation in many instances is that the only land line video provider will be an OVS provider. This could occur a number of ways:

- (1) -- The incumbent cable operator switches to becoming an OVS provider. This is particularly likely to occur if the cable provider provides local telephone service. As you know, having cable companies provide phone service was stressed by Vice President Gore in his recent speech to the NCTA convention; was encouraged by the 1996 Telecommunications Act; and now is starting to occur. For example, attached are the first few pages of Continental Cablevision's May 9 application to provide telephone service in those areas of Michigan where it has cable systems. This includes the state capital -- Lansing -- as well as numerous other cities.

It is highly likely that other cable operators in Michigan and other states will follow Continental's example such that they will be local exchange carriers and thus claim that they can switch to being OVS providers.

- (2) -- In many areas, the phone company can buy out the cable company as is now expressly allowed under new Section 652 of the Communications Act (added by the 1996 Act). Section 652 in general allows such buyouts in more rural areas, for all but the largest cable operator in the top 25 television markets, and for certain cable systems outside the top 100 television markets.
- (3) -- In the medium to longer run, the laws of economics (in particular those relating to natural monopolies) may result in there being "one wire" to many subscribers homes which provides both telephone, video and data. This could be the result of either the cable operators displacing the phone companies or vice versa. In either case, the resulting entity will be a local exchange carrier and claim that it can be an OVS provider.

Thus, either by cable operators providing telephone service today or other mechanisms the nation is likely to face large numbers of areas where the OVS operator is the only wired video provider, as opposed to the OVS provider being an overbuilder.

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLP}
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ms. Meredith Jones

May 14, 1996

Page 3

Redlining/Discrimination: A monopoly OVS provider with no restraints on where and who it serves is likely to discriminate against large segments of the nation's population in the provision of service. These groups -- predominately minorities, low income groups or growth areas on the edge of municipalities -- will either have no video service or distinctly inferior service (as current 1960's or 70's cable systems are not upgraded, while more affluent areas are upgraded to a fiber-standard). The reason for the discrimination would be the desire of the OVS operator to focus on more affluent -- and thus more profitable -- areas.

Examples of this could be the following:

- As you are aware in Washington, the cable company has had significant difficulties providing cable service in the Anacostia area. If it is an OVS provider and there are no constraints on where and whom it serves, Anacostia is likely to be left with distinctly inferior cable service, if any at all.
- In Detroit, Dallas, New York, Los Angeles and other major urban centers, the low income inner city areas are likely to not be served by OVS, or again receive inferior service. For example, Detroit has 62% of its population below the poverty line and has only 31% penetration on cable, less than half the national average. The figures and risks for Dallas are comparable. A current example of such redlining comes from San Francisco, where we are informed that the current operator (Viacom/TCI) does not serve certain minority/low income areas of the city (who thus have no cable service) because it claims that it is not required to do so because (according to the operator) language requiring this was not contained in its franchise to serve the city.

These illustrations show how the lack of any requirement on where and who to serve could lead to major discrimination in the provision of OVS services. The resulting harm is particularly great where OVS is the only wired provider.

To prevent these types of problems cable franchises typically contain a density requirement, which if met, requires the cable operator to serve all residents of the area in question. For example, a franchise might require service without any line extension charge by the cable operator wherever there are X dwelling units per mile of street (pro-rated up or down for areas of more or less than one mile).

Municipalities with denser populations typically require in their cable franchises that service be available to all residents, with service to any low density areas being more then compensated for by high density areas.

Finally municipalities have "anti-redlining" provisions in their franchises, for example as directed by Section 621(a)(3) of the 1984 Cable Act. Often such provisions predate or are more expansive in the list of invidious criteria than Section 621(a)(3).

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ms. Meredith Jones
May 14, 1996
Page 4

The problem is equally acute in growth areas and lower density areas towards the edge of urban areas where cable operators (for example) often contend that the housing density is too low for them to provide service. A good example of what could occur comes from Las Vegas, NV where the cable operator refuses to serve much of the growing suburban areas because it claims its franchise lacks any "dwelling units per mile" requirement.

This type of problem is fairly widespread towards the edges of metropolitan areas and in more rural areas where the single biggest cable issue is not cable rates or cable channels, but the inability of subscribers to obtain cable service. Again, municipalities address this problem through density (dwelling units per mile) requirements described above.

In conclusion, there is thus a major risk that without requirements on OVS providers of where and whom they serve, that minority, inner city and growth areas of the nation's municipalities may be left without any kind of wired video service. The numbers in question could be large, e.g. 20-40% of the nation's population.

Control Right-of-Way/Compensation: One element of the compensation which a municipality receives for the use of its right-of-ways is adequate assurance that its citizens will be served and will not be discriminated against. The exact language will vary from community to community, such as the dwelling units per mile or "serve all residents" examples described above. Such provisions affirmatively prevent discrimination based on race, income level, public assistance status or housing density.

The key is that rights-of-way are owned by the public. The public, through the municipality, is constitutionally entitled to just compensation for use of the rights-of-way. Such compensation takes a variety of forms, including not only monetary compensation but requirements such as those set forth above to ensure that public rights-of-way are used to serve the public generally and to prevent their use in a discriminatory fashion. Such provisions ensure that as many residents as reasonably possible are provided service.

Note that the preceding provisions extend not just to who is provided service but are often applied to such factors as the timing of the building (or rebuilding) of a system so that an operator cannot obtain indirectly (by a 15 year build of a 10 mile system) what it could not do directly.

Municipalities thus have the authority, as a part of the just compensation they receive and to prevent discriminatory use of public property, to take analogous actions in the OVS area.

FCC Authority and Rules Needed: For the reasons set forth above, the matter of where and whom OVS operators serve is an issue this Commission must address. Casting the issue as a "universal service" issue is probably not correct because, as the Commission is aware, cable operators currently do not serve all (or nearly all) residents of the United States (in contrast to phone companies, which effectively do provide service to most U.S. residents), and OVS is likely to be more like cable than telephone. It would be very unfortunate if this Commission were to adopt rules which would have the effect, as early as the summer or fall of this year, of allowing

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLC}
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ms. Meredith Jones

May 14, 1996

Page 5

cable companies to start discriminating against minorities, low income groups or lower density geographic areas as described above.

We thus believe the Commission should, at minimum, do the following in its OVS rules: First, it should set forth a minimum density requirement for service of no more than 10 dwelling units (occupied or unoccupied) per mile of street. All areas meeting this requirement (pro-rated up or down for areas more or less than one mile) would have to be wired for OVS service within two years. An OVS provider could deviate from this requirement only if it has obtained the advance concurrence of the municipality being served, and if such deviation is approved by the Commission in the certification process. Adopting a single standard would provide the OVS providers with a simple, clear test of general applicability, yet would require them to consult with local municipalities -- who without question are most knowledgeable as to local conditions -- in situations where deviations from this standard are warranted.

As an example, municipalities have seen variations in density and service area requirements based upon such peculiarly local factors as terrain (mountains, rivers, lakes), man made obstacles (mining areas, Federal installations), and unique variations in demographics, housing and other residential occupancy patterns.

Second, the Commission should enunciate strong rules against discrimination on invidious grounds analogous to (but more extensive than) those set forth in Section 621(A)(3) of the Cable Act and make clear that any violation of such provisions would automatically result in OVS certification being terminated and the operator becoming a cable operator. An example of such language is attached.

Third, the Commission should take strong action to prevent cable operators from "redlining" cities with large minority populations. For example, it should prevent an OVS operator from electing to serve only the Maryland suburbs but not serving Washington D.C. at all. Actions such as this are essential to see that the nation's major urban centers with substantial minority populations, such as Detroit, Newark and many others are not denied service on racial, invidious or other self-serving grounds, while nearby communities are served. Thus the Commission should require an OVS operator providing service in an area near a municipality with a significant minority or low income population to start providing service to the latter municipality within two years of its starting to provide service to the nearby community (and to provide service to all areas of the minority/low income community within four years of starting to provide service in the nearby community). Only an absolute requirement such as this will prevent OVS operators from redlining many of this nation's cities. If OVS operators wish to have the benefits of relaxed regulation they must accept the burden of strong measures against discrimination.

Municipalities would still be able to act in the certification process or pursuant to the right to obtain just compensation if the result of the preceding were inappropriate for the municipality in question.

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLP}
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Ms. Meredith Jones
May 14, 1996
Page 6


OVS Unavailable to Cable: The reasons set forth above further illustrate why cable operators should not be able to "switch" to being an OVS operator. This would lead to claims on their part that the dwelling units per mile, anti-redlining or other requirements in their franchises no longer apply, with the risks of no cable service or discrimination in service described above.

Conclusion: Again, we appreciate your meeting with us. We believe this issue which you raised is one with serious implications and hope the preceding analysis and recommendation is helpful.

With best wishes,

Very truly yours,

VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT^{LLP}


John W. Pestle

JWP/nk

cc: Mr. Rick Chessen, Cable Services Bureau
Mr. Gary Laden, Cable Services Bureau

RECEIVED

MAY 29 1996

EXHIBIT A

FCC MAIL ROOM

Operator shall not fail to provide service, deny service, deny access to service or otherwise discriminate in the area served, availability, quality, content, rates, terms or conditions of service provided to actual or potential subscribers on the basis of race, color, creed, religion, ancestry, national origin, sex, disability, age, location, marital status or status with regard to public assistance. Operator shall comply at all times with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations relating to nondiscrimination.